

# Educational Reform in Contemporary Japan: Individualization and Internationalization?

Jie Qi

This is a study about the different ways in which the notion of educational reform in Japan has been influenced by various social and historical trajectories. Educational reform today is a "hot" issue in Japan. Among many major issues, the following two have attracted considerable attention. On the issue of the role of the state in education, there are two distinct sides. The pro-Government side believes that educational reform in Japan since the end of the World War II has made schools better; the anti-Government side argues that educational reform since the end of World War II has made schools worse. On the one hand, the pro-Government scholars argue that educational reform has provided more freedom and more choices to teachers and students and the curriculum has become more decentralized (Imazu, 1993; Ohashi, 1997). On the other hand, the anti-Government scholars protest that educational reform has reduced students' learning opportunities and intervened in the freedom of teachers (Amano, 1995; Horio, 1988, 1992, 1994; Yamazumi, 1987).

Although the above two viewpoints derive from completely different doctrines (we may call the former "conservative" and the latter "progressive" or "Marxist"), both of them assume that there has been continuity in educational reform in Japan. However, my intention in this paper is seek to interrupt such developmental assumptions about continuity in Japanese educational reform since the end of World War II. I assert that there have been

many ruptures and discontinuities in the history of Japanese educational reforms, that the educational system in Japan today is not simply the one introduced by the U.S. occupation, but it has undergone various reforms, and that each reform movement conceptualizes a different image of the ultimate in education. This paper also seeks to problematize what has been taken for granted in issues such as individualization and internationalization in Japanese education since the 1980s. I argue that the official discourses on individualization and internationalization have constructed various versions of citizenship and nationalism.

The major documents for this paper are official and semi-official documents on educational reform. The official documents are issued by the Ministry of Education, and the semi-official documents include the ones proposed by educational reform consultative bodies. I consider all of them discursive technologies that constitute educational reform in Japan.

The theoretical orientation of this study is Michel Foucault's conception of power and history. For Foucault, power is neither an ideological concern, nor a domain dominated by one social group over others, but exists only as it is exercised (Foucault, 1986, 1988, 1991). Foucault's notion of history is genealogy. The objective of genealogy is to historicize the subject, that is, to demonstrate that events and circumstances are historically contingent (Foucault, 1978, 1984). Using Foucault's theory to examine educational reform movements in Japan, we can

read educational discourse differently. Instead of using Marxist approaches that tend to identify how reform movements are ideological products and what is in need of reform, the use of Foucault's theory enables me to open up new spaces of possibility for understanding how these reform movements occurred and they are the effects of multiple power relations. Regarding talking about the needs of future reform, Foucault's theory cautions me that all of the reform movements involve inclusion and exclusion at the same time.

#### Educational Reform in the American Occupation Period (1945-1952): Democratization and Decentralization

After World War II, under the supervision of American Occupation General Headquarters (GHQ), the Japanese government started the postwar reconstruction of Japan. A big change in education as well, took place immediately following World War II. A series of regulations regarding school reform were laid down by the American Occupation General Headquarters and the Japanese government. *United States Initial Post-Surrender Policy for Japan* issued in August 1945 states:

The ultimate objective of the United Nations with respect to Japan is to foster conditions which will give the greatest possible assurance that Japan will not again become a menace to the peace and security of the world and will permit her eventual admission as a peaceful member of the family of nations. Certain measures considered to be essential for the achievement of this objective . . . include, among others . . . the abolition of militarism and ultra-nationalism in all their forms; the disarmament and demilitarization of

Japan, with continuing control of Japan's capacity to make war, the strengthening of democratic tendencies and processes in governmental, economic and social institutions; and the encouragement and support of liberal political tendencies in Japan. . . As soon as practicable educational institutions will be reopened. As rapidly as possible all teachers who have been exponents of militant nationalism and aggression and those who continue actively to oppose the purposes of the military occupation will be replaced by acceptable and qualified successors. Japanese military and para-military training and drills in all schools will be forbidden.

Following this regulation, many changes occurred in schools. During wartime, all school textbooks and curricula had to conform with nationalistic aims, to build up among students a Japanese patriotic spirit and loyalty to the Emperor, to exalt their national spirit, and to make them sacrifice themselves for the sake of the state (Anderson, 1975; Miyoshi, 1993). School subjects were mathematics, science, military training, Japanese history, moral education and national studies (Karasawa, 1971). One of the objectives of this curriculum was to prepare the Japanese pupils to sacrifice themselves for the war. School curriculum and textbooks were designed by the government in order to promote nationalism. Textbooks of Japanese history, for example, described the Emperor as God and ethnocentrically represented the Japanese "race" as superior to all other races. Similarly, moral education emphasized obedience to the Emperor and the state, and inculcated pupils with nationalism (Horio, 1994; Katsuta, 1993). In addition, such activities as marching drills and worshipping the Emperor were done routinely in schools.

Under the supervision of the American

Occupation, the Japanese government abolished all military training in schools, revised textbooks to eliminate representations of militarism and ultranationalism. Moral education, Japanese history, and geography were suspended from the curriculum because the available textbooks were full of the propaganda, ultranationalism, and militarism. In addition, it was considered that moral education was linked with loyalty and obedience to nation, and moral education would be used for the revival of ultranationalism or militarism (Miyoshi, 1993). The Japanese curriculum during the American Occupation reflected the post-war shift away from nationalism and militarism. This shift was not only imposed by the Americans, it was also adopted and promoted by Japanese educational reformers.

In March 1947 the Japanese government passed the Fundamental Law of Education which replaced the 1890 Imperial Rescript on Education as the decisive statement of education policy. Its function was to fulfill the educational guarantees which the Constitution of Japan issued in 1946. The new education system established a 6-3-3 ladder, with the first nine years both compulsory and free for all children. This laid the foundation of the contemporary school system. In sharp contrast to the Imperial Rescript, the Fundamental Law redefined the aims of education, encouraging students to contribute to the peace of the state, to pursue truth and justice, to respect individual values, to esteem hard work, and to acquire an independent spirit.

The Ministry of Education issued the *Course of Studies* in March 1947 as a guide for local boards of education and schools. It abolished the uniform national textbooks and emphasized the autonomy of local boards of education and schools. Accordingly, decentralization became the chief concern. Local boards of education were encouraged to determine curricula

and choose textbooks (Anderson, 1975; Miyoshi, 1993). Subjects offered at elementary schools generally were Japanese, mathematics, social studies, science, music, drawing and crafts, and physical education; the secondary school curriculum added vocational education and foreign languages to this list.

However, we have to be aware that all these regulations regarding educational reform issued by the Japanese government were under the supervision of American Occupation General Headquarters. The construction of the notion of "democracy" and "decentralization" involved multiple power relations. The Ministry of Education, Yoshishige Abe addressed the first meeting of the U.S. Education Mission to Japan in 1948:

... democracy is meant to combine respect of individuality with the idea of equality of human beings, so should culture and education in a nation also respect both the national and the international. National superstitions should, of course, be rejected, especially the case of a false history constructed by ultranationalistic policies and that of an irrational interpretation of mythology. But, the characteristics of a tradition that is still alive among the people should be respected. Thus I would like to ask America not to deal with us simply from an American point of view. . . democratic education cannot be carried out in our country in exactly the same way as it is in yours (p. 84).

In the official rhetoric, "democracy" was meant to "combine respect of individuality with the idea of equality of human being;" whereas the practice of "democracy" was a reaction against the wartime hardships and restraints placed upon freedom (Abe, 1994, p. 83).

The construction of "decentralization,"

according to the U.S. Education Mission, is a particular "reorganization of the Ministry of Education" (Beauchamp & Vardaman, 1994, p.73). "Decentralization," generally speaking, merely referred to the relationship between the national government and the local government but had nothing to do with schools and school teachers. We can see this from the Board of Education Law issued in July 1948:

*Article 48.* Prefectural Boards should have control over all schools and other educational institution established by the prefectures concerned, and local boards of Education shall have control over all schools established by the local public bodies concerned.

*Article 49.* The Board of Education shall take charge of the following matters: (1) Matters concerning establishment, control and abolishment of schools and other educational institutions; . . . (3) Matters concerning curriculum contents to be taught and their treatment; (4) Matters concerning selection of textbooks; . . . (12) Matters concerning social education; (13) Matters concerning study and self-improvement of principals, teachers and professional educational personnel; . . . (20) Other matters concerning educational affairs of the community under its jurisdiction.

*Article 50.* Of the affairs placed under the power of the Board of Education, the following matters shall be taken charge of by the prefectural Board of Education exclusively: (1) Matters concerning of principals and teachers of national and public schools, superintendents of education and teacher consultants . . . ; (2) Approving textbooks for all schools within the prefecture concerned in accordance with the standards established by the Minister of Education; . . . (quoted in Beauchamp &

Vardaman, 1994, p.119)

Thus, schools and teachers were excluded from the construction of decentralization reforms. They were under the control of the local board of education on school curriculum, textbook-choosing, in-service teacher training, etc.

Official discourses on democratization and decentralization within the context of post-war educational reform involved multiple power relations in multiple layers: the U.S., the Ministry of Education, local boards of education and schools. On one hand, the local board of education was recognized to be more independent from the Ministry of Education. On the other hand, schools and teachers were under the control of the local board of education.

#### Educational Reform in the Post-Occupation Period (1952-1960):

##### The Reconstruction of the Japanese "Good Citizen"

From the end of the American Occupation period in 1952 through the late 1950s, the Japanese educational system underwent a period of transition. After independence was returned to the Japanese government, the Japanese government started to reconsider the "democratic" ideals brought by the American Occupation General Headquarters.

The Ministry of Education therefore began to modify the decentralized educational system. The *School Board Law* issued in 1956 reduced the local board of education's authorities in areas such as curriculum planning and textbook selection. In 1958 the *Course of Study* was revised and regulated curriculum and textbooks. In contrast to the first version of the *Course of Study* issued in 1947, the new *Course of Study* attained legal status. The *Course of Study* issued in 1947 was not official or mandatory. However, in the *Course of Study* issued in

1958, the Ministry of Education established regulations that schools and teachers had to teach what was prescribed in the *Course of Study*. If any school or teacher did not follow this rule, the administrator or the teacher would be dismissed from school (Katsuta, 1993; Miyoshi, 1993).

The new *Course of Study* required the addition of moral education at all grades of compulsory education for one hour a week. The Ministry of Education declared (1958):

moral education aims to develop a Japanese who will never lose the consistent of respect for his fellow man, who will realize this spirit in home, school and other actual life in the society of which he is a member, who strives for creation of a culture rich in individuality and for the development of a democratic nation and society, and who is able to make a voluntary contribution to the peaceful international society (p. 11).

Moreover, what should be taught in the moral education classes was: "basic patterns of daily life, moral sensibility and judgment, development of individuality and [a] creative attitude toward life, [as well as] moral attitude as a member of national and local communities" (Ministry of Education, quoted in Anderson, 1975, p. 113).

This new type of moral education was different from pre-war and wartime moral education which aimed to mandate pupils to be loyal to Emperor and make pupils sacrifice themselves for the military state. In contrast, the reintroduction of moral education constructed a new version of what it meant to be a citizen of Japan. It was considered that the "Japaneseness" should be "something more harmonious with Japanese traditions and culture" (Beauchamp & Vardaman, 1994, p. 10). This

type of "Japaneseness" was different from the one during the wartime. What to be mean a Japanese during the World War II was that the Japanese had to be loyal to the Emperor and the State. After the war, Japanese citizenship meant affiliation with a concept of nationhood.

Thus, the reform of American-influenced democratization in education created a new image of the Japanese, that is, the Japanese should understand the Japanese culture and traditions very well, always behavior properly within a group and make contribution to the Japanese society. The qualities of the "good" Japanese citizen were respect for fellow citizens, creativity and individuality, and democratic and peace-oriented values.

#### Educational Reform in the 1960's and 1970's: the "Image of the Ideal Japanese" as a "Good Worker"

In the late 1950s, Japan began a period of high economic growth. Leaders from the economic world started to speak about educational reform, and the Japanese government strove to modify the Japanese educational system to meet the needs of industry. In 1960 the Economic Planning Agency's Economic Council issued the *Report on the Long-Range Educational Plan Oriented Toward the Doubling of Income* which emphasized the importance of education as an investment in developing human resources. This report asserted that in order to meet the industry's need for skilled workers, schools had to improve science and technical education: "Future progress in economics and social welfare depends largely on the effective use of the human resources of the education" (Shimahara, cited in Beauchamp & Vardaman, 1994, p. 17).

In 1962, the Japanese government decided to create a new system for the technical colleges

in order to "train technicians with well-rounded general knowledge and a thoroughly specialized knowledge in technology" (Ministry of Education, 1985, p. 13). Technical education had never been so important.

In 1966, the Ministry of Education, supported by the industrial world, issued the document, the Image of the Ideal Japanese in which the following were considered to describe the ideal Japanese:

*A. Respect for Work.* Society is the source of production which provides greater happiness for its members. For that purpose we must love our work and devote ourselves to it. Through work we can live a good life and help others also to live a better life.

*B. Contribute to the Social Welfare.* The development of science has given us many blessings as well as many troubles. It has indeed helped us to solve many of man's problems. However, with the development of industry, the growth of cities, traffic congestion, air pollution, etc., man is threatening his existence with the deterioration of his environment. Our modern society has become so interrelated that the individuals's welfare cannot be separated from the general welfare. Hence it is essential that a spirit of social service be promoted based on a sense of social solidarity.

*C. Creativity.* In this age of popularization of culture, society tends to be pleasure-seeking and wasteful. We must develop a productive and creative society emphasizing our traditional virtues of work and economy. A constructive and creative man loves his work and devotes himself to it, be it on the farm, in the factory, or in the school.

This document illustrates that the "ideal Japanese" must love to work. What it means to be a "good worker" within the Japanese

context, historically and socially speaking, is the "efficient worker," that is, one who works hard and long hours, cooperates well with other co-workers, follows the superior's orders and dedicates himself to the company. It is obvious that the production of a "good worker" is for the sake of the economic sector, but it is also an aspect of citizenship and nationalism. The chairman of the Central Council on Education established by the Ministry of Education, Morita, has explained:

We now possess a dual, perhaps even three-leveled, economic structure, and in response to social demands for a diversified work force suited to these conditions, it is necessary to diversify the latter part of secondary education. The guiding ideas for the reform of educational content in response to this economic imperative is provided for us in "The Image of the Desired Japanese" (quoted in Horio, 1988, p. 158).

Generally speaking, Japanese educational reform was justified in terms of economic matters from the 1960s to 1980s. The economic world was closely tied to educational reform. At the same time, the Ministry of Education attached great importance to economic success. The educational reform during the 1960s and 1970s was aiming to create Japanese as symbolized in "The Image of Ideal Japanese." The production of the "ideal Japanese as a good worker" as a technology, reshaped the notion of what to be meant "education." Education, became "not just a vehicle for upward social mobility, but a *condition* [sic] for social placement at all" (Roesgaard, 1998, p. 54).

Ultimately, for the child to become the "desired Japanese" means to get into one of the most desirable schools and colleges. In 1980, 99.98 percent of juveniles completed the nine years of compulsory education, and 94.2

percent of juveniles graduated from senior high schools. However, only 37.4 percent of the senior high school graduates could receive higher education because of the limited number of colleges and universities, while more than 66 percent of senior high school graduates wanted to enter colleges or universities (Amano, 1995). Therefore, students experienced severe competition in the college entrance examination.

In summary, the construction of the "ideal" Japanese during the 1960s and the 1970s was different from the one during the middle and late 1950s. There was a shift of the notion of citizenship from the immediate postwar period to the present. In the middle and late 1950s, the Ministry of Education sought to produce the "proper" Japanese citizen who respect the particular Japanese culture and value. The initial intention for the Ministry of Education was to repel the "democratic" thoughts impelled by the U.S. However, during the 1960s and 1970s, the new ideal Japanese citizen was produced to meet the needs of the industrial world. The official discourses on educational reform were mainly articulated in terms of econometrics as a technology for creating the new citizen. The creation of good workers for the industrial world and an ideal of productive national citizenship is what the Ministry of Education documents constructed.

#### **Educational Reform in 1980's and 1990's: the Notion of Individualization and Internationalization**

Early in the 1980s, educational reform started to criticize the production of "unthinking workers" (Amano, 1995; Horio, 1988). In 1984, the Provisional National Council on Educational Reform (*Rinji Kyoiku Shingikai*, hereafter NCER), as an advisory body to Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, was established.

The members of the NCER were industrial leaders, university professors, researchers, novelists, etc. About half of the members were not from the business or industrial sector. This was the first time people from the cultural arena were officially designated to speak on educational reform. By then, it was already the privilege of the industrial leaders to officially advise the Ministry of Education on educational reform.

The officially announced purpose of the Council was: ". . . to propose relevant reforms of government policies and practices related to education to enable the educational system to respond to recent social changes and cultural developments and thereby to achieve the aim of education as defined in the Fundamental Law of Education of 1947" (NCER, 1987, p. v).

By 1987, almost three years later, the NCER proposed four reports on basic points of view for educational reform. The NCER has summarized the substance of the four reports which were:

- a) the principle of putting emphasis on individuality;
- b) transition to a lifelong learning system;
- c) coping with various changes
  - i. coping with internationalization trends;
  - ii. coping with an information-oriented society.

It is considered that these educational reform proposals laid the foundation for the education system in the present because the NCER employed the very-modern rhetorical phrases such as individuality, internationalization and information.

Generally speaking, it has been taken for granted that the educational reform in Japan has been turning gradually toward individualization and internationalization since the 1980s. However, my purpose is to interrupt the notion

that such individualization and internationalization has been essentially the same throughout this time, as I have demonstrated the notion of citizenship has shifted over time. In the following two sections, I will examine the notions of "individualization" and "internationalization" described by the NCER. I assert that "individualization" and "internationalization" are merely slogans used repeatedly by the NCER, and that they have constructed various notions of citizenship and nationalism.

### **Individuality Defined by the NCER: Institutional Individuality<sup>1</sup>**

The word individuality in different societies may carry different meanings. Even within a society, historically speaking, there may be many shifts of the notion of individuality. The concept of individuality and its meaning in the NCER's discourse is an ambiguous subject. In the second report issued in April 1986, the NCER emphasizes:

We have reaffirmed that the dignity of individuals and respect for individuality, as well as an independent spirit, can be fostered only on the basis of a balanced and moderate development of freedom and discipline, and that equal opportunity for all in accordance with the abilities of individuals is a moderate approach for maintaining a balance between freedom and equality, while adhering to the principles of the dignity of individuals and respect for individuality and avoiding a harmful egalitarianism in which difference of individuals are ignored (NCER, 1987, pp. 87-88).

The NCER asserts that individuality should be associated with respect for freedom. This represents a shift in Japanese understandings of individuality. Then, what does the NCER mean

by the word "freedom?" In the first report announced in June 1985, the NCER describes:

freedom is quite different from looseness, anarchy, irresponsibility or lack of discipline. Freedom implies assuming heavy responsibility. Those who are living in a society where increasing freedom of choice is provided are required to have the capacity to shoulder this lofty freedom and to assume growing responsibilities while enjoying freedom. In this sense the dignity of an individual, respect for individuality, freedom, self-discipline and responsibility are inseparable from each other. To develop oneself fully is to help develop others to the full, to know oneself is to know others, and to think much of oneself is to think much of others, and vice versa. In other words, oneself and others are interwoven with each other (NCER, 1987, p. 14).

The NCER conceptualizes that "freedom" is a relative subject and always associated with the "others." That is, individual freedom of action is constrained within the bounds of the group. Now, let us look at how the NCER defines the term individuality. The first report states:

Individuality means not only the individuality of each person but also the individuality of each family, each school, each community, each industrial firm, each nation, each culture, each era, etc. Each of these individualities is not isolated from other individualities. Only those who know their own individuality, develop it to the full and fulfill their own responsibility, can pay due regard to the individuality of other people and help develop it to the full (NCER, 1987, pp. 13-14).

In the NCER's discourse, the emphasis on



individuality is not for the sake of the individual but for the sake of the group, community and society. In constructing individuality, the NCER defines "individuality" as existing within a group, within society, in the world (Roesgaard, 1998, pp. 161-162). The purpose for the NCER's emphasis on individuality is to enclose the individual within the social organizations. Therefore, the NCER's individuality is a kind of institutionally focused individuality.

However, this was the first time that the official or semi-official discourse articulated citizenship in terms of *individuality*. Although I consider such individuality the institutionally focused individuality, it is different from the notion of "good citizen" and "good worker" constructed during the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. The previous notions of "good citizen" and "good worker" did not embody any existence of single individual, whereas the notion of institutionally focused individuality recognizes the existence of single individual. To put it differently, the notion of "good citizen" and "good worker" is only looking at the group but not at the individual, while then turning to the group.

#### The NCER's Notion of Internationalization: Nationalism

Internationalization is another major catchphrase of the NCER's reform proposal. Internationalization, in the NCER's term, is to "make the development of Japanese competent to live as members of the world community and to enable Japanese contribute to the world community in various fields including the arts, research, culture, sports, science, technology and the economy" (NCER, 1987, p. 93). Further, the NCER describes what Japanese needs acquire in order to make contribution to the world community:

1. Relevant knowledge and abilities which make it possible to think with an

international and global perspective;

2. The language ability to communicate with members of other cultures, power of expression, cosmopolitan etiquette and knowledge; and
3. Broad and profound knowledge about Japan with which one can explain persuasively about Japan's history, traditions, culture, society and other aspects (NCER, 1987, p. 94).

For the NCER, the purpose of emphasizing such internationalization is as much to build up the nation as it is to make contribution to the world community. I argue that such internationalization is merely a slogan, and that it simultaneously fosters the idea of nationalism within internationalization.

Firstly, the NCER asserts that in order to actualize such internationalization it is very important for the Japanese to be Japanese first:

If Japanese people are to be accepted in the international community, they are to be requested to have the identity of being a Japanese and, at the same time, to have the attitude and ability to regard themselves as relative being. More specifically, they are required to have a profound knowledge about Japanese culture, to regard Japanese values as relative ones, and to enrich and enlighten themselves spirally (NCER, 1987, pp. 407-408).

What the NCER considers the "good Japanese" is: a) have a deep understanding of Japanese culture and traditions; b) love the notion of Japan; c) respect the unofficial national anthem (*kimigayo*) and unofficial national flag (*hinomaru*) (NCER, 1987). Especially, the emphasis on respect for *kimigayo* and *hinomaru* is controversial within Japan and some Asian countries.

*Kimigayo* and *hinomaru* were the Japanese

national anthem and flag until the end of the World War II. They were abolished after World War II since they were considered the symbols of the aggressive war. Thereafter, Japan did not have an official national flag and anthem. The Japanese Constitution did not include any provision for the Japanese flag and anthem. It can be said that the call for *kimigayo* and *hinomaru* is to promote nationalism.

In time, in the *Course of Study* issued in 1990, the Ministry of Education decided that the use of *Hinomaru* and *Kimigayo* at school entrance and graduation ceremonies were compulsory. The logic for the Ministry of Education is that Japanese have to respect other countries' national flag and anthems while they are abroad, therefore, Japanese have to respect their own national flag and anthem first. In 1999, the Japanese Diet modified the Japanese Constitution. *Hinomaru* and *kimigayo* became the official national flag and anthem. Thus, the institutional discourses of educational reform have instituted the notion of nationalism rather than internationalism.

Secondly, enhancement of Japanese language education both in Japan and abroad is another major issue inhering the NCER's educational reform discourse.<sup>2</sup> In the Fourth Report announced in August 1987, the NCER emphasizes:

With regard to Japanese language instruction for foreigners, it is urgently required to carry out scientific research on the Japanese language as a lingua franca and to develop appropriate teaching methods and materials. The training of teachers of Japanese as a foreign language should be accelerated, and efforts should be made to ensure that the Japanese language be more widely learned and used in foreign countries (NCER, 1987, p. 405).

The NCER further addresses:

It is necessary to carry out scientific research on the Japanese language as an international language and to develop appropriate teaching methods and materials. In particular, it is necessary to establish undergraduate and graduate courses for the teaching of Japanese as a foreign language. It is also necessary to ensure that the Japanese language be more widely learned and used in foreign countries, for example, by sending Japanese teachers of the Japanese language, as well as teaching materials, and aids, to foreign university, upon their request, under exchange programs between Japanese and foreign universities (NCER, 1987, p. 407).

The NCER put much more emphasis on distributing Japanese language to the rest of the world than fostering foreign language education for the Japanese. Making Japanese as a "lingua franca," is what the NCER intended. Generally speaking, it was believed that the Japanese has already contributed to the world economically, therefore, the Japanese language has to permeate the whole world, too. It can be argued that the NCER's discourse on internationalization constructs "Japanization," that is, the purpose for the NCER to advocate internationalization is not only for the sake of the rest of the world, but also for Japan itself.

Thirdly, similar to the idea of teaching Japanese language, the NCER underlines the importance of distributing the Japanese culture to the rest of the world:

Japan efforts have so far been focused on importing and transplanting science and technology from advanced industrialized countries in Europe and North America. It has not always made adequate efforts with regard to the international exchange and contribution in the fields of education,

research, culture and sports. . . It will also become important for Japan to make international contributions in respective fields. . . The increased exchange of persons may cause what is called cultural frictions. Such friction, however, should be considered as normal phenomena in the international community. . . the distinctive characteristics, as well as the university, of the Japanese tradition and culture will be rediscovered and recognized anew, and the Japanese culture will be able to contribute to the creation of the peaceful and prosperous international community based on coexistence and cooperation among diverse cultures and among pluralistic systems (NCER, 1987, pp. 465-466).

In the NCER's context, the key of how to overcome cultural frictions for Japanese is not to try to have better understanding of other cultures, but is to spread the Japanese culture throughout the world. Striving to introduce Japanese culture into foreign countries is one aspect of the NCER's technologies of internationalization.

The Ministry of Education has further taken over this NCER's assertion. In the *Course of Study* (1989), the Ministry of Education places emphasis on how schools should teach "Japan's magnificent culture and traditions" and how "seek to enhance educational content to focus on cultivating understanding and affection for the Japanese nation and its history and fostering the attributes of Japanese people living independently in the international community" (MESSC, 1999, p. 174).

Thus, as we have discussed, the NCER's educational reform discourses on "internationalization" are such things as being "good Japanese" and introducing Japanese language and culture to other countries. Participating actively in the world community not only economically but also politically and culturally is what the NCER intended.

## Concluding Thoughts

There are many books which have titles such as "educational reform for the twenty-first century" in Japan. Books which have such titles usually provide a path, a way for the future. The purpose of this paper is different. It is to trace the path of past notions of citizenship as embodied in Japanese educational reforms from the postwar period to the present. In undertaking this task I first look at the way reforms which took place in the 1950s and 1960s created a new image of the "good" Japanese citizen and "good" worker. I next look at a second wave of reforms which have taken place between the 1980s and the present, problematizing the commonplace understanding that this represents a move towards individuality and internationalization. I conclude with the metaphor of educational reform in Japan as dramaturgy.

However, my purpose in this paper is not to make proposals of what the future educational reform should be or how we can make schools better since I believe there is no any guarantee for the future. My intention in this paper is to demonstrate that modern institutional discourses of educational reform in Japan have shifted over time. From the construction of the notion of democracy in the end of the World War II through the production of the "Japanization" in the contemporary society, there are many ruptures emerging in the discourses. Also, different historical discourse conceptualizes different notion of what to be meant "education," e.g., in the end of the World War II, "education" meant "democratization" whereas "education" meant social replacement in the 1960's and 1970's.

Moreover, skepticism is what we need when we read these institutional discourses of educational reform. Through careful textual analysis, we are able to perceive that "individualization" and "internationalization"

employed by the National Council on Education Reform and the Ministry of Education have conceptualized the notions of "anti-individualization" and "nationalism." It is dangerous to be deluded by the literal sense of the words. We have to read the documents historically, and not only rhetorically.

1. In Japanese schools, students are disciplined to express individualism for themselves to benefit the group, e.g., family, class and school. The following is an example that teachers often use in the class: "You did well on your project. Your family will be proud of you because your project will help the class."
2. Although the NCER has put so much emphases upon distributing Japanese language to the rest of the world, generally speaking, there is a common belief in Japan that the Japanese language is so particular that it is impossible for foreigners to acquire.

## REFERENCES

- Abe, Y. (1994). Bases for educational reconstruction. In R. Beauchamp, and J. Vardaman. (Eds.). *Japanese education since 1945: A documentary study*. (pp. 82-85). Armonk: An East Gate Book.
- Amano, I. (1995). *Kawaru syakai kawaru kyoiku*. Tokyo: Yushindo.
- Anderson, R. (1975). *Education in Japan: A century of modern development*. Washington: Office of Education
- Beauchamp, R, & Vardaman, J. (1994). *Japanese education since 1945: A documentary study*. Armonk: An East Gate Book.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality: An introduction*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York: Random House.
- Foucault, M. (1984). Truth and power. In P. Rabinow (Eds.). *The Foucault reader*. (pp. 51-75). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1985). *The use of pleasure*. (R. Hurley, Trans.). Vol. 2 of *The History of sexuality*. New York: Random House.
- Foucault, M. (1986). *Disciplinary power and subjection*. In S. Lukes (Eds.). *Power* (pp. 229-242). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In M. Martin, H. Gutman, and P. Hutton (Eds.). *Technologies of the self* (pp. 16-49). Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, and P. Miller (Eds.). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in governmentality*. (pp. 87-104). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Horio, T. (1988). *Educationa thought and ideology in modern Japan: State authority and intellectual freedom*. (Eds. And Trans. S. Platzer). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Horio, T. (1992). *Gendai kyoiku no shisou to kouzou*. Tokyo: Iwanami Syoten.
- Horio, T. (1994). *Nihon no kyoiku*. Tokyo: Tokyodaigaku Press.
- Imazu, K. (1993). *Syogai syakai no mado: Otona no seichou to seichousuru otona*. Tokyo: Daiichihoki Syuppan.

- Karasawa, T. (1971). *Gendai kyoiku no kadai*. Tokyo: Iwanami Syoten.
- Katsuta, S. (1993). *Gendai kyoikugaku nyumon*. Tokyo: Yuhikaku.
- MESSC (Ministry of education, Science, Sports and Culture) (1999). *Japanese government policies in education, science, sports and culture 1999: educational reform in progress*. Tokyo: Okurasyo Press.
- Miyoshi, N. (1993). *Nihon kyoikushi*. Tokyo: Hukumura Shuppan.
- NCER (National Council on Educational Reform, Government of Japan). (1987). *Reports on educational reform*. Tokyo: Okurasyo Press.
- Ohashi, S. (1990). *Sengo nihon no kyoiku shiso*. Tokyo: Meijitosyo Syuppan.
- Roesgaard, Marie H. (1998). *Moving Mountains: Japanese education reform*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Yamazumi, M. (1987). *Nihon kyoiku syoshi*. Tokyo: Iwanami Syoten.

## 要 旨

### Educational Reform in Contemporary Japan: Individualization and Internationalization?

戚 傑

本論文は、ミシェル・フーコーの歴史観・権力観を用いて、歴史的、社会的及び文化的視点から戦後日本の教育改革、学校教育について日本人論と関連付けて分析を試みた。

ミシェル・フーコーの歴史観・権力観を要約すると、「真理」は、絶対的な歴史的相対性であり、「歴史学の歴史」は社会における思考のシステムで真理と誤謬の生産体制であり、「ポストモダン社会における権力メカニズム」は単なる高圧的でなくディシプリンとセルフディシプリンの芸術的集大成であると表現できる。このような歴史観・権力観に基づいて、本研究は、まず戦後再構築された日本の政治・経済・社会システム及び文化選好が日本の教育に如何に影響を与え、日本の教育システムにおける権力構造が移り変わる過程を辿り、現代日本人の思考構造の枠組が戦後日本の教育によって形成されるプロセスを明らかにしたうえで、「理想的な日本人像」は学校教育のカリキュラムにどのように組み込まれたかについて論じた。

次に、「理想的な日本人像」とそれに付随する「理想的な生徒像」は国家権力はもとより、多種多様な力による相互作用の結果として形成され、固定することのないイメージとして時代の変化とともに揺れ動く過程を分析した。

最後に、80年代以後の教育改革で「理想的な日本人像」に「個人化」と「国際化」を新たに加えられたことにより、イメージとしての「理想的な日本人像」の揺れが一層振幅を増し、より流動的になったこと、その結果、かえって反「個人化」、反「国際化」の生まれる余地が与えられたことを指摘した。

(2002年11月1日受理)